

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 8, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Allowable claims

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 6 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed below, applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims from which claims 6 and 12 depend are patentable.

Claim objections

Claim 15 stands objected to as lacking antecedent basis for the term “the antennas.” Claim 15 has been amended to recite “the antenna.” Applicants assert that claim 15 is allowable and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-11, 13, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,269 (Dorenbosh) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,936,936 (Fisher) and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,608,264 (Fouladpour). Applicants will address each rejection in the order presented in the Office Action.

Independent claim 9

Dorenbosh in view of Fisher and Fouladpour does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a mobile communication system, as recited in claim 9, that includes a router configured to directly communicate wirelessly with a plurality of the wireless-enabled communication devices. The Examiner stated that Dorenbosh discloses “a router ... for communicating wirelessly through the at least one antenna with a wireless-enabled communication device....” Office Action dated 2/8/07, p. 3. Dorenbosh, however, discusses a wireless transceiver 102 and 108, and a network interface 106 that are coupled to another network. For example, the cited portions of Dorenbosh discuss that the network interface 106 is for coupling to a first IP network 204, and the transceivers

are for coupling to IP local area networks as well. *Id.*, col. 1, l. 56 – col. 2, l. 17. Thus, Dorenbosh discusses coupling the router 100 to client terminal equipment 202 through the LAN, rather than connecting directly wirelessly to the client terminal equipment 202. In contrast, claim 9 recites a mobile communication system including a router configured to directly communicate wirelessly through at least one antenna with a wireless-enabled communication device, wherein the router is configured to provide a direct wireless network connection to a plurality of the wireless-enabled communication devices. Thus, for at least these reasons claim 9 is patentable.

Dependent claims 10 and 11

Claims 10-11, which depend from independent claim 9, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 9.

Independent claim 1

Dorenbosh in view of Fisher and Fouladpour does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a mobile communication system, as recited in claim 1, that includes a router configured to directly communicate wirelessly with a plurality of wireless-enabled communication devices. The Examiner stated that Dorenbosh discloses “a router ... for communicating wirelessly through the at least one antenna with a wireless-enabled communication device....” Office Action dated 2/8/07, p. 6. As discussed above, the router disclosed in Dorenbosh does not directly communicate wirelessly with the client terminal equipment 202, rather communication takes place through a separate LAN to which the router 100 is coupled. In contrast, claim 1 recites a mobile communication system including a router configured to directly communicate wirelessly through at least one antenna with a wireless-enabled communication device, wherein the wireless router is configured to provide a direct wireless network connection to a plurality of the wireless-enabled communication devices. Thus, for at least these reasons claim 1 is patentable.

Dependent claims 2-3, 5, and 7

Claims 2-3, 5, and 7, which depend from independent claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Dependent claim 16

Claim 16, which depends from independent claim 1, is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Independent claim 13

Dorenbosh in view of Fisher and Fouladpour does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a wireless router including communication circuitry configured for direct wireless communication only with personal-use computing devices. The examiner stated that Dorenbosh discloses “communication circuitry (104, 106, 110, 102) (see figure 1) for electronic communications and for wireless communications only with personal-use computing devices 202....” Office Action dated 2/8/07, p. 12. As discussed above, the processor 104, the network interface 106, the memory 110, and the transceiver 102 disclosed in Dorenbosh do not directly communicate wirelessly with the client terminal equipment 202, rather communication takes place through a separate LAN to which the router transceiver 102 is coupled. In contrast, claim 13 recites a wireless router including communication circuitry configured for direct wireless communications only with personal-use computing devices to provide access to wired communications to a plurality of appropriate personal-use computer devices as wireless communications via the antenna. Thus, for at least these reasons claim 13 is patentable.

Dependent claims 4, 14, and 15

Claim 4, which depends from independent claim 1, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosh, in view of Fisher, in view of Fouladpour and in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0082341 (Stanforth). The Examiner does not assert that Stanforth makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 1 from which dependent claim 4 depends. Thus, dependent claim 4 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 14-15, which depend from independent claim 13, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosh, in view of Fisher, in view of Fouladpour and in further view of Stanforth. The Examiner does not assert that Stanforth makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 13 from which dependent claims 14-15 depend. Thus, dependent claims 14-15 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 13.

Dependent claim 8

Claim 8, which depends from independent claim 1, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosh, in view of Fisher, in view of Fouladpour and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,651,328 (Huang). The Examiner does not assert that Huang makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 1 from which dependent claim 8 depends. Thus, dependent claim 8 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 17-19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosh in view of Fisher.

Claim 17

Dorenbosh in view of Fisher does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a portable wireless local area network that includes a plurality of mobile communications devices that are configured to communicate via a device antenna directly with a router, where the router is configured for direct wireless communication via an antenna. The examiner stated that Dorenbosh discloses “a plurality of mobile communication devices (202, 100’) (see figure 3) ... wherein the plurality of mobile communication devices can communicat[e] with each other through the router.” Office Action dated 8/27/06, p. 20. As discussed above, the processor 104, the network interface 106, the memory 110, and the transceiver 102 disclosed in Dorenbosh do not directly communicate wirelessly with the client terminal equipment 202, rather communication takes place through a separate LAN to which the router transceiver 102 is coupled. In contrast, claim 17 recites a portable wireless local area network including a router configured for direct wireless communications and a plurality of mobile communication devices configured to communicate via a device antenna directly with the router. Thus, for at least these reasons claim 17 is patentable.

Dependent claims 18-19 and 21

Claims 18-19 and 21, which depend from independent claim 17, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 17.

Dependent claim 20

Via Electronic Filing
Date of Deposit: April 4, 2007

Claim 20, which depends from independent claim 17, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosh, in view of Fisher, and in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0152285 (Wheeler). The Examiner does not assert that Wheeler makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 17 from which dependent claim 20 depends. Thus, dependent claim 20 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 17.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If a telephone conversation with Applicant's representative would help expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 542-6000.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required to Deposit Account 50-0311, Reference No. 18133-196. The Director is further authorized to charge any required fee(s) under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.19, 1.20, and 1.21 to the abovementioned Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Jason Mirabito, Reg. No. 28,161
Kyle Turley, Reg. No. 57,197
Attorneys for Applicants
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,
GLOVSKY AND POPEO, PC
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
Tel.: (617) 542-6000
Fax: (617) 542-2241
Customer No. 30623

Date: April 4, 2007